

University of Warwick institutional repository: <http://go.warwick.ac.uk/wrap>

This paper is made available online in accordance with publisher policies. Please scroll down to view the document itself. Please refer to the repository record for this item and our policy information available from the repository home page for further information.

To see the final version of this paper please visit the publisher's website. Access to the published version may require a subscription.

Author(s): Beck, S.R., Robinson, E.J. & Freeth, M

Article Title: Can children resist making interpretations when uncertain?

Year of publication: 2008

Link to published version:

http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=MIimg&_imagekey=B6WJ9-4P903JR-1-

[1&_cdi=6873&_user=585204&_orig=browse&_coverDate=04%2F30%2F2008&_sk=999009995&view=c&wchp=dGLbVzW-zSkzS&md5=0dc64bf6a0b2a84ef5ecbaa7b947630c&ie=/sdarticle.pdf](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=MIimg&_imagekey=B6WJ9-4P903JR-1-1&_cdi=6873&_user=585204&_orig=browse&_coverDate=04%2F30%2F2008&_sk=999009995&view=c&wchp=dGLbVzW-zSkzS&md5=0dc64bf6a0b2a84ef5ecbaa7b947630c&ie=/sdarticle.pdf)

Running Head: Resisting responding to ambiguity

Can children resist making interpretations when uncertain?

Sarah R. Beck

University of Birmingham, UK

Elizabeth J. Robinson

University of Warwick, UK

& Megan Freeth

University of Nottingham, UK.

Author note

Sarah R. Beck, School of Psychology, University of Birmingham, UK; Elizabeth J. Robinson, Department of Psychology, University of Warwick, UK; Megan Freeth, Department of Psychology, University of Nottingham, UK.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Sarah R. Beck, School of Psychology, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham, B15 2TT, UK. E-mail: s.r.beck@bham.ac.uk

Abstract

In two experiments we examined young children's ability to delay a response to ambiguous input. In Experiment 1 5- and 6- year olds performed as poorly when they had to choose between basing an interpretation on ambiguous input and delaying an interpretation as when making explicit evaluations of knowledge. Seven- and 8- year olds' found the former task easy. In Experiment 2 5- and 6- year olds performed well on a task that required delaying a response but removed the need to decide between strategies. We discuss children's difficulty with ambiguity in terms of the decision making demands made by different procedures. These demands appear to cause particular problems for young children.

Keywords: Ambiguity; Knowledge; Implicit and Explicit Understanding;

Can children resist making interpretations when uncertain?

Imagine the end of a film in which the hero has just seconds to defuse a bomb. As the countdown ticks by, he wavers over the red or green wire unable to be certain which must be cut. As the countdown reaches its last second, he cuts the red one. Fortunately, if unsurprisingly, he defuses the bomb and saves the day. In a tense situation, he who hesitates is lost. Of course, there are many other situations when being cautious is advisable. If the hero in the thriller had several hours left on the countdown, it would have been ridiculous for him to gamble. Given the opportunity he should wait for his specialist colleague to arrive and tell him, unambiguously, which wire to cut. In both scenarios our hero finds himself confronted by uncertainty. The crucial wire is either the red or the green one, and at the moment he does not know which. Two quite different courses of action are appropriate depending on the situation. In this paper we consider one of these responses: delaying an interpretation.

There are two ways in which one might be described as resisting responding to problematic information. First, one might make a decision not to respond recognizing delay as a good course of action on this occasion. In the (unlikely) film ending where our hero could wait for his colleague this strategy would be the rational option. Second, sometimes people hesitate when they encounter problematic information. Although a response is delayed, this is incidental rather than deliberate. This kind of delay not only is unintentional, but also may not be optimal. In the classic film ending the hero must make a choice, since hesitating means it is more likely that the bomb will explode.

In what follows we examine when and how children can resist responding to a particular type of problematic input: ambiguous information. We investigate the possibility that until the age of about 7 children have difficulty deciding how to respond to ambiguous input. To do this we compare how children perform on two tasks, one in which they have to decide to delay a response and another in which the delay is more incidental. It is possible that this incidental delaying of a response might be described as implicit understanding. We return to this issue later.

Before we come to examine whether children can delay their responses to ambiguous information we first briefly summarize the substantial literature on young children's difficulties with ambiguous input. In line with this literature, we define input as ambiguous when one piece of information (such as, a word, message, or view) has multiple possible interpretations. When children older than about 7 years encounter an input that has more than one possible interpretation, they know that they cannot be sure of its meaning. They respond appropriately by stating their ignorance, seeking out disambiguating information, or perhaps making a tentative interpretation. On the other hand, this input causes serious problems for younger children. In a typical experiment the child sees two pictures: a strawberry and a tomato. One of these pictures is then hidden behind a card so all that can be seen is a small patch of red. Young children consistently claim that they can know which picture is hidden (e.g., Taylor, 1988; see also, Bearison & Levey, 1977; Robinson & Robinson, 1982). They continue to do this in the face of feedback that they have been wrong in the past and when given incentives to be cautious.

One possibility is that children make a pragmatic interpretation of ambiguity tasks. They understand that they do not have enough information to be certain, but they

judge it is better to guess than be cautious. We might think of children as treating every ambiguous situation as akin to the film climax where there are only a few seconds left. Making a snap decision seems to them the most sensible response. This is unlikely given children's performance on other measures. Children's problems are not limited to deciding whether or not to make an interpretation. They tend to describe ambiguous messages themselves as "good" or "clear" (e.g., Singer & Flavell, 1981), they claim the speaker "said enough" for a confident interpretation to be made (Robinson & Whittaker, 1986), and they blame the listener rather than the speaker when communication fails (Robinson & Robinson, 1977).

Children's difficulties persist when the metacognitive and linguistic demands of these tasks are reduced. When offered alternative strategies to remove the ambiguity, children fail to employ them appropriately. Young children do not ask questions to disambiguate problematic messages (Ironsmith & Whitehurst, 1978), nor do they use a simple behavioral strategy to obtain more information (for example, looking in the potential hiding places before committing to a choice, Beck & Robinson, 2001).

Is there any evidence that children might be able to delay their responses when they encounter ambiguity? In fact several studies that have observed children's nonverbal reactions suggest this is the case. In one study children between the ages of 4 and 10 showed longer reaction times when a message had multiple interpretations. They also made more eye contact with the speaker and more hand movements, although the pattern of responses varied slightly among ages (Patterson, Cosgrove, & O'Brien, 1980). In a game where toys were hidden in a dolls' house, and children were given clues to their location 5 year olds took longer to begin searching when a message could refer to more

than one hiding place than when it had only one possible referent (Plumert, 1996). When children were asked to follow ambiguous instructions to build a model, 5- and 6- year olds showed similar behavioral signs of problem detection, e.g., pauses and puzzled expressions (Flavell, Speer, Green, & August, 1981). In all these studies children's nonverbal behavior was out of line with their explicit responses (judging their own knowledge or deciding whether to ask a question). In keeping with the literature described above, 5- and 6- year olds tended to be overconfident saying they knew the referent, and avoiding asking questions. Data from an eye tracking study with 4- to 7- year olds offers further nonverbal evidence of understanding. When children heard an ambiguous pronoun, they looked more to an alternative pictorial representation of a sentence than they did on hearing an unambiguous pronoun (Sekerina, Stromswold, & Hestvik, 2004). Together these papers indicate that children take a relatively long time to respond and appear to hesitate when they encounter ambiguous information.

Another group of studies does not offer such an optimistic view of children's ability to resist interpreting ambiguous input. These studies were motivated (at least in part) by a concern that children may find it especially difficult to say that they do not know or "can't tell" what the solution to a problem is. As an alternative, children were offered the choice between making an (inappropriate) interpretation or asking another character for information. In one task, 5- and 6- year old children heard a story where a doll gave a message to her friends about where she was going swimming which could refer to one of two locations (Somerville, Hadkinson, & Greenberg, 1979). Half the children were simply directed to say that they "couldn't tell" if the message was inadequate. The other half were given the option to ask a shopkeeper who had seen which

way the main character had gone. No advantage was conferred by elaborating the “can’t tell” response with the option to “ask the man”. A similar comparison was made by Robinson and Whittaker (1985, Experiment 2). Once again, performance was no better by a group of children who were directed to point to a “mystery man” (a doll covered in question marks) when they did not know the correct referent of a message, than performance by a group told to tell the experimenter when they could not know. These studies suggest that 5- and 6- year olds found it difficult to resist making an interpretation of ambiguous input, even when the alternative was to delay an interpretation briefly to gain disambiguating information.

Finally, a different task used by Klahr and colleagues (Fay & Klahr, 1996; Klahr & Chen, 2003) presented children with increasing evidence and examined whether they would wait until they had sufficient evidence before judging that this was a determinate or indeterminate problem. For example, the child saw a target model made of red plastic pieces, and four boxes were opened sequentially revealing different colored plastic pieces in each. After each box was opened, children were asked whether they could say for certain which box the model had been made from, or whether they would have to guess. Although 4- and 5- year olds performed well when all the boxes were opened (which is somewhat younger than most studies find that children will acknowledge their uncertainty in similar situations), when only some of the boxes were opened children had substantial problems acknowledging that the contents of unopened boxes should influence their evaluation of certainty. Children judged whether they could tell or had to guess which box the model came from based on the open boxes alone: if there was only one match among the open boxes they judged they could tell, if there were multiple

possible matches they said they had to guess. In this task, children did not take in to account how information they were yet to find out should influence their current judgment, and they did not appear to understand that sometimes one needs to wait in order to make an accurate evaluation. Children's performance improved on this task when they were given explicit feedback and training, and 5- year olds maintained this improvement several months later. Perhaps this indicates that children will find delaying an easy strategy to adopt. Although we did not use a training paradigm in our study, we used a very simple delay task. Unlike Klahr's task, children will not have to decide to wait to see if the new information will mean that they can or cannot make an interpretation. In our experiments, the goal is always to make an informed interpretation. The decision is about when to make it.

Thus, there is something of a discrepancy in the literature regarding whether or not children can delay making interpretations of ambiguous input. Some accounts of children's difficulty with ambiguity suggest that their problem lies in their inability to resist making an interpretation. One particularly specialized explanation is Acredolo and Horobin's premature closure theory (Acredolo & Horobin, 1987). According to this children search for a possible referent on receiving ambiguous input. As soon as they find a potential referent it is accepted as the correct interpretation, and children stop searching. The message is deemed a good one because it allowed him/her to find a referent. Other accounts suggest that children appreciate that there are multiple potential referents and the problematic nature of the message. Their pragmatic interpretation of the experimental set up is that one should make an interpretation when possible. Thus, they make guesses based on heuristics (Speer, 1984) and will always favor acting rather than withholding

judgment (Ackerman, 1981). These accounts find it easy to explain why children have difficulty with many of the established tasks, including the “ask a man” tasks and Klahr’s indeterminacy tasks. According to them, as long as children can make an interpretation there is no need to consider alternative strategies. However, these accounts do have difficulty accommodating the nonverbal data.

The accounts in the preceding paragraph focus on children’s behavior in the particular circumstance when they encounter ambiguity. We group these as performance accounts. Other accounts focus on the representational demands of ambiguity tasks. According to Chandler and colleagues (Chandler, 1988; Carpendale & Chandler, 1996), children do not appreciate the interpretative nature of mind until they are about seven years old. That is, they fail to understand that two people given the same input may make different judgments about it. In the example of the partial view of a tomato or strawberry one person could interpret the patch of red as being the tomato, while a second person could think it is the strawberry. Development of this understanding allows children to recognize why ambiguous input is problematic and deal with it appropriately. Related accounts based on the development of understanding and representing different psychological interpretations of the same physical input have been described by Pillow and Henrichon (1996) and Apperly and Robinson (1998). These accounts also have difficulty explaining why children appear to hesitate when they encounter ambiguous input. It is possible they could argue that the nonverbal tasks rely on a more implicit representation of knowledge, although this has not been made explicit by any of these authors.

One reason for the discrepancy between performances on the nonverbal reaction and more explicit “ask the man” tasks might be that the latter make various extra demands over the need to recognize that the input is ambiguous and could refer to multiple possible referents. Children have to know not only that they do not know the correct referent, but also that further information will help. Perhaps they might even try to imagine what this information is. Furthermore, in some “ask the man” tasks once the child has made a choice between asking or interpreting the trial appears to end: asking for more information does not help you make an accurate interpretation. One possibility is that if we offered children a very simple choice between delaying and interpreting, then they would reveal an understanding of how to deal with ambiguity as suggested by their apparently hesitant nonverbal reactions. We did this in Experiment 1.

On the other hand, it might be that another difference between the nonverbal reaction tasks and “ask the man” tasks causes the discrepancy in performance. In the latter the children have to decide on which course of action or strategy is best, that is, choose between interpreting and seeking new information. In the related field of theory of mind, Perner and colleagues have suggested that these decision making or judgmental aspects of a task may be especially difficult for young children (Clements & Perner, 1994). One possibility is that if we remove the requirement to make a decision about how best to deal with the information children might find it easy to succeed on a task that involved ambiguous input. In Experiment 2, we introduce a simple procedure that required no explicit judgment about how to handle the ambiguous input: the stamp game. If children were to find this task easy this would suggest that it is with the decision making demands of some ambiguity tasks that their problems lie.

Experiment 1

We designed a procedure in which children were given a choice between making an immediate response based on ambiguous input and delaying that response temporarily to make a better informed interpretation. We modeled our task on the cones game used by Beck and Robinson (2001) in which children were given a choice between two behavioral strategies to locate a hidden toy: making an interpretation and seeking new information. On different trials in the cones game children received informative or ambiguous input about the location. It was appropriate to make an interpretation when the input was informative, but to seek new information when it was ambiguous. Five- and 6-year olds found the cones game difficult and were unable to use the two strategies appropriately. In the new delay game presented here a toy was hidden and, as before, children encountered a first clue containing either informative or ambiguous input. Children had to decide whether to make an interpretation immediately before a second clue was read or whether to wait for the second clue before making their interpretation. When the first clue was informative, the most efficient response was to make an immediate interpretation. When it was ambiguous, it was appropriate to choose to delay interpretation. The new procedure shares qualities with the “ask the man” tasks in which children can make an interpretation or ask a character for disambiguating information. We made two modifications for our procedure. First, the presentation of the extra information was inevitable. Thus, the focus was not on the children deciding if there was information missing that could help them make a decision, but they had only to decide not to make an interpretation yet. Second, the information was really given to the children to improve their choices.

We used a knowledge evaluation task as a comparison. The toy was hidden and an ambiguous or informative message given. Then children were asked, “Do you really know where it is or don’t you really know?” This type of question has been used extensively with young children and requires an explicit judgment about the quality of the information. Typically, 5- and 6- year olds over-estimate their knowledge in response to this question.

Method

Participants. We tested 52 children from a primary school, serving working and middle class populations in Birmingham, UK. There were 31 children in the younger group (11 girls and 20 boys). Their ages ranged from 5;2 - 6;1. There were 21 children in the older group (10 girls and 11 boys). Their ages ranged 7;2 – 8;1 (Individual ages were unavailable for this sample). The majority of children at this school were from Asian backgrounds. The other children were from Caucasian, African, and Caribbean backgrounds.

Materials. A video tape box containing a tape and an unmarked cardboard box (approx. 30 cm x 10 cm x 3 cm) were used for the ignorance check trials. In the experimental trials we used pictures of two characters: Peter (in the delay game) and Claire (in the know game) (approx 15 cm x 10 cm), pictures of toys (10 cm x 10 cm), and two blank cards (10 cm x 10 cm). We used colored envelopes marked with spots, stripes or, in the introductory trials, a triangle. A screen was used to prevent children seeing the hiding process. Pieces of pink paper were used for the clues.

Procedure. We first checked that children were prepared to acknowledge ignorance. They were shown the unmarked box and asked, “Do you really know or don’t

you really know what's in here?" The correct answer was to acknowledge ignorance. If children offered a guess, then we prompted them again asking if they really knew. We also included a trial using the video box. This was intended to make the game less intimidating for the children, as we expected they would be able to say what was in the video box.

All children played both the delay game and the know game. The order of the two games was counterbalanced between children. Each game included two ambiguous and two informative trials. Within each game, trials were alternated. We counterbalanced the order of trials in the two games (that is children who had an informative trial first in the delay game were equally likely to have an informative or ambiguous trial first in the know game and vice versa).

In the *know game* children were shown the picture of Claire and the toy pictures. They were told that the experimenter would hide one of Claire's toys in one of three envelopes and their job was to find the toy. They were shown the blank cards, and it was explained that they would not be able to work out which was the correct envelope just by looking. First, there were two introductory trials. The experimenter took three envelopes of different colors (e.g., one red, one blue, one yellow). She hid the toy in one envelope (using the screen so that children could not see), and placed blank cards in the other two envelopes. The cards were laid out in front of the child, and the experimenter gave a clue, "I've hidden the ball in one of these envelopes. I'll tell you what color it is, it's blue." Clues were read from distinctive pieces of pink paper. The experimenter then asked the test question, "Can you just tell me, do you really know where it is or don't you really know?" Regardless of response, on the introductory trials the experimenter explained,

“This time there’s only one blue one, so you really know which one it is don’t you.” The toy was retrieved from the blue envelope. On the second introductory trial three envelopes of the same color, but each of a different pattern, were used. The clue “It’s yellow” did not allow the child to make a confident interpretation. The child was asked the test question, and once again the experimenter explained that as all the envelopes were the same this time the child could not really know where the toy was. To complete the trial, the toy was removed from its envelope.

There followed four experimental trials, two ambiguous and two informative. On each trial there were two envelopes of one color and one of another, or two envelopes of one pattern and one of another. The key dimension (color or pattern) on each trial was counterbalanced. Informative messages referred to the uniquely colored or patterned envelope. Ambiguous messages referred to the two same colored / patterned envelopes. The experimenter read the clue and then asked, “Can you just tell me, do you really know where it is or don’t you really know?”

No feedback was given on experimental trials. To give the trial a satisfactory ending if children answered that they did know, then they were asked to indicate which envelope they believed contained the toy. This envelope was put to one side, “to be opened at the end of the game”. If children said they did not know, then all three envelopes were stored for the end of the game.

In the *delay game* there were also two introductory and four experimental trials. In this game we used the other character, Peter. As for the know game, a toy was hidden in one of three envelopes. The experimenter told the child that on each turn there would be two clues. These were represented by two pieces of pink paper. On each trial the

envelopes were laid out in front of the child, and the two clues were also placed clearly on the table, away from the envelopes. Children made an interpretation by moving the doll to stand by an envelope. Alternatively, they could choose to delay by standing the doll by the next clue. The instructions were, “If you can find the right one, then you can move Peter to sit by the envelope straightaway. But if you can’t find the right one straightaway, and want to wait for the next clue, then you can move him to wait by the next clue.”

On the first introductory trial three different colored envelopes were used, and a clue was given which identified just one of them. The experimenter explained that this time the child knew straightaway which was the right envelope, and so s/he should move Peter to stand by the correct envelope. The experimenter assisted with this, and then read the second uninformative clue, “It’s spotty” (all the envelopes were spotty on this trial). The toy was retrieved from the envelope. On the ambiguous introductory trial, having read the first clue, the experimenter explained that as all the envelopes were the same color, “You can’t tell yet, can you? You need to wait until I’ve read another clue, so we put Peter over here to wait by the next clue.” The child (assisted by the experimenter) moved Peter to stand by the pink paper representing the second clue. The experimenter then read the second clue, which was informative. The child made an interpretation and the toy was retrieved from the envelope. At the end of the introductory phase, the experimenter reiterated the rules, “Sometimes you can find the right envelope straightaway and you can move Peter straight to the envelope, but sometimes you need to hear the next clue, and so you move him here [to the clue]”

There followed four experimental trials: two informative and two ambiguous. The second clue was always read on each trial, but the child was not allowed to change any interpretation. Because of the behavioral nature of this task, we retrieved the toy from an envelope on each trial. On ambiguous trials, if children had made an interpretation the second clue contradicted this. We used duplicate target toy cards so that if this did happen we could open a different envelope to the one chosen. Thus, if children chose the inappropriate strategy on an ambiguous trial we always gave them negative feedback – they did not find the toy. On informative trials the second clue was always consistent with the first. Children who had made an immediate interpretation had it confirmed. Those who had chosen to delay were now able to make an interpretation based on both clues.

Results and Discussion

Performance on the ignorance check question was generally good. Forty-five children out of 52 said that they did not know what was in the unfamiliar box (32 did so immediately in response to the question, “Do you really know or don’t you really know what’s in here?” Thirteen children guessed a possible content for the box, but when the question was repeated, to prompt children just to evaluate their knowledge, these children said they did not know). Seven children (six younger and one older) answered “yes” to the ignorance check question (two immediately and five following a guess). We excluded these seven children from further analysis, as it seemed likely they were exhibiting a yes bias. This was supported by the observation that these children answered yes to all experimental questions. Thus, in the sample used for analysis there were 25 younger and 20 older children. We ran all our statistical tests including the children who failed the

ignorance check. The findings were the same as when we excluded these children. We also noted that some children were prepared to say that they did not know what was in the video box. Twelve younger and three older children said they did not know.

The mean numbers of correct responses are shown in Table 1. Performance on informative trials was near ceiling for both age groups on the know game and for the older children on the delay game. To investigate whether younger children discriminated between trials on the delay game we coded the number of times children chose to wait on each trial type (the correct response on ambiguous trials, the incorrect response on informative trials). Older children's results were not included in this analysis because of their ceiling performance. We ran a repeated measures ANOVA with trial (ambiguous, informative) as a within subject factor and game order (delay or know first) and trial order (ambiguous or informative first on delay game) as between subject factors. There was a main effect of trial $F(1, 21) = 14.21, p = .001, \eta_p^2 = 0.40$. Younger children were more likely to choose to delay on ambiguous (Mean = 1.20) than on informative trials (M = 0.49). There were no main effects of or interactions with either order factor.

We considered the possible effects of the negative feedback in the delay game. Children might have learnt from this feedback that choosing an envelope rather than waiting for the next clue was unsuccessful. In this case we would have expected children to be more likely to select the alternative strategy on the second ambiguous trial. However, of the children who incorrectly chose to make an interpretation rather than wait on the first trial of the delay game all but one made the same strategy choice on the second ambiguous trial. Is it possible that children's overall performance was depressed by this negative feedback, i.e., that some of those children would have delayed on the

second ambiguous trial had it not been for the feedback? Perhaps children who believe they had made a plausible interpretation and were then told it was wrong would feel that it did not matter what they did in this game and adopt a strategy of always making a guess. Although this may account for some children's persistence with the interpretation strategy, we cannot separate them in our data from children who think that it is appropriate to make an interpretation. We note, however, that in other studies children have been quick to revise their interpretations of ambiguous input when told they are incorrect, and they do not seem overly confused by finding that their plausible interpretation has been contradicted (Beck & Robinson, 2001).

To make comparisons between age groups we identified those children who responded appropriately on three or four trials on each game, see Table 2. This criterion meant that the individual child moved the doll to wait by the clue or said "don't know" more often on the ambiguous than informative trials. Using chi square tests (with corrections for continuity) to compare the distributions in each age group we found that a significantly higher proportion of children in the older group (95%) than the younger group (44%) achieved this on the delay game, $\chi^2(1, N = 45) = 10.81, p = 0.001$. There was no significant difference between the proportions succeeding in the older (60%) and younger (48%) groups on the know game.

Comparison between games: We made comparisons between games for each age group using two-tailed binomial tests. The younger children found the delay game as difficult as the know game (four passed delay but not know, five showed the opposite pattern). However, the older children's performance was significantly better on the delay

game than the know game (six passed delay but not know, none showed the opposite pattern), $p = 0.031$.

Older children performed better on the delay game than the know game. Perhaps children who understand about ambiguity find some strategies easier to use than others. Different strategies may make varying incidental demands, or some may be intrinsically more attractive. Yet younger children, who performed poorly on the knowledge evaluation task, found it no easier to choose to delay. A number of them passed only the know or the delay game. Perhaps they too are susceptible to varying demands in the two somewhat different tasks. However, our main conclusion from Experiment 1 does not concern the relationship between the two tasks, but rather the finding that when children are given the chance to delay a response to gain further information, their performance remains poor. Choosing to delay a response is not an easy way for young children to reveal their understanding of ambiguity. We now turn to the second possibility. Might children pass a task where they do not have to explicitly choose between strategies and any delay is incidental rather than deliberate?

Experiment 2

We devised a new procedure called the stamp game. A stream of information was presented, and children were instructed to wait until they knew for certain which referent was intended, i.e., they were not required to make a decision about how to handle ambiguous input. To present the stream of information, we gradually slid a piece of card across a picture slowly uncovering it. Children had a picture sheet with four pictures on it and were directed to stamp on the matching picture as soon as they knew which it was. The disambiguating feature was positioned so that it was revealed on the first half of the

picture or the second half. Thus, we could code whether children stamped before or after the halfway point. We used three types of trials: in informative trials the disambiguating piece of information was revealed on the first half of the picture, making it appropriate not to wait to but to stamp straightaway; in uninformative trials the first half of the picture did not offer any useful information; in narrowing trials the first half narrowed one's choice of referents from four to two. In uninformative and narrowing trials the most appropriate response was to wait until the second half of the picture was revealed and then stamp to indicate an interpretation. We used two types of ambiguous trial (uninformative and narrowing) to see if children's performance differed when the first information they were exposed to increased their knowledge from when it told them nothing. Both types of ambiguous input have been used in previous studies that offered children a choice between obtaining disambiguating information and making an interpretation. For example, in Somerville, Hadkinson, and Greenberg (1979) there were two possible destinations, so on ambiguous trials the clue could not rule out either one. In Robinson and Whittaker's mystery man study the clue narrowed the potential referents (dolls) to two from a set of three. We did not expect this to make a difference to children's know judgments (see Beck & Robinson, 2001). However, we speculated that uninformative trials (where the first half of the picture revealed no useful information) may give children the best chance possible of resisting making an interpretation on the stamp game.

Method

Participants. We tested 80 children from two schools serving working and middle class populations in Birmingham, UK. There were 40 girls and 40 boys. The mean age

was 5 years and 11 months (range 5;6 – 6;5). Children were alternately allocated to either the know group or the stamp group. There were 41 children in the know group and 39 children in the stamp group.

Materials. We used sets of four pictures printed on sheets of paper approximately 20 cm by 15 cm, for example, four boys holding balloons. The key disambiguating feature was a different color for each picture, e.g., each boy wore different colored trousers. On narrowing trials another feature differed between pictures dividing them into two pairs, e.g., two boys held a green balloon, two held a red balloon. Picture sets were always presented in the same order: boats, boys, cups, butterflies, ladies, flowers. There were three groups of sheets to counterbalance the order of trials. Trials could be Uninformative, Narrowing or Informative. Trials for Group A were in the order: Uninformative, Narrowing, Informative. This order was repeated to give six experimental trials. The order for Group B was: Informative, Uninformative, Narrowing, and for Group C was: Narrowing, Informative, Uninformative. For simplicity we used only three trial orders, however, the orders chosen had the undesirable consequence of always presenting trials in the same relative order. We address this in the results section.

We used seven target pictures, approximately 20 cm by 15 cm. Each was identical to one of the four pictures on each picture sheet (referred to as the matching picture). We used a piece of card approximately 21 cm by 16 cm which covered the target picture. Target pictures were drawn so that when they were half covered by the card the first feature but not the second feature could be seen. For the warm-up trial, we used a target picture of a snowman and a picture sheet of four snowmen, all had pink hats and each had

differently colored buttons. For the stamp group we also used a rubber stamp and an ink pad.

Procedure. Children played either the know game or the stamp game. We used a between participants design so that we could use the same materials for both games. At the beginning of each trial children in both groups saw a set of four pictures and were asked to name the colors of the key features.

We used a warm-up trial to explain the procedure to the child. The experimenter said, “I’ve got one of these pictures on this card and your job is to work out which one it is.” For the *know group*, children were shown the target picture of a snowman half covered by the card. Thus, the first feature but not the second feature could be seen. The experimenter explained to the child, “You can see what color hat he’s got on can’t you. But look, they’ve all got pink hats on, so you don’t know which one he is do you.” Then she said, “Let’s look at all the picture.” Having removed the card to reveal the picture she explained, “Now, look, you can see he’s got green buttons. So now you know which one is on the card, don’t you.” Children were encouraged to identify the matching snowman on the sheet. For the *stamp group* warm-up, the experimenter explained that she had covered the target picture with the card, but she would gradually reveal it. The child was told, “as soon as you know which picture is on the card, you stamp the picture on your sheet.” The experimenter slowly moved the card across the target picture, so that it was steadily uncovered over a period of about 6 seconds. As the first feature (the flag) was uncovered, the experimenter said, “Now, we can see that he’s got a pink hat, but they’ve all got pink hats so don’t stamp yet” As the card was slid to reveal the buttons, the experimenter said, “Now, look, you can see he’s got green buttons so now you can

stamp.” As soon as the child stamped a picture, the experimenter stopped revealing the card. The experimenter then lifted the card to reveal the whole picture, and the child and experimenter identified the matching picture. The experimenter explicitly reminded the child of the correct response in the stamp game, “Remember as soon as you know which one it is you stamp on your sheet.”

There followed six experimental trials. Trials were uninformative where the first feature was the same for all pictures on the sheet, and the second feature was different for all of the pictures; narrowing where the first feature was the same color for two pictures and a different color for another two pictures, and the second feature was different for all; or informative where the first feature was different for all the pictures, but the second was the same color on all pictures. Both uninformative and narrowing were ambiguous trials, where the first feature seen did not pick out one referent. Each child had two trials of each type, in one of the three orders described above. On every trial the experimenter told the child, “I’ve got one of these [pictures] on this card.”

For the *know group* the experimenter showed children the target picture, half covered by the card so that the first, but not the second, feature could be seen. She asked, “Do you really know which one it is, or don’t you really know?” If children said they did know they indicated which they had chosen and were shown whether this matched the target. If they admitted ignorance the experimenter showed them the target, so they could find the matching picture. This was repeated for each experimental trial.

For the *stamp group* the experimenter showed children the completely covered target picture. Children held the ink stamp in their hands ready to stamp at the start of each trial, and the experimenter reminded them to stamp as soon as they knew which

picture was hidden. The experimenter then gradually revealed the target by sliding the card across the picture. A mark on the target card indicated the halfway point, and the experimenter used this to determine when children stamped. Once children had stamped, they were shown whether this matched the target. This procedure was repeated for each experimental trial.

As in Experiment 1 we used an ignorance check trial. This came at the end of the procedure for the know group. Children were shown an unfamiliar and unmarked box, and they were asked, “Do you really know what’s in here or don’t you really know?”

Results.

Four children in the know group failed the ignorance check question. Three of these children answered yes to every question. One answered yes to all but one (uninformative) trial. We did not include an ignorance check for the stamp group because those children were not asked any metacognitive questions. Thus, to avoid excluding children asymmetrically from only one group, we included all children in our analysis. We repeated our statistical tests excluding the children who failed the ignorance check. There was no difference in the pattern of results.

On the experimental trials children gained one point if they made the appropriate response. For the uninformative and narrowing trials this was to answer “no” or refrain from stamping until the second half of the picture had been revealed. On informative trials the appropriate response was to answer “yes” or stamp when the first half of the picture was revealed. Each child had two trials of each type, and scores were summed across trial type, see Table 3. These data show that, in line with our suggestion, children were slightly more successful in resisting stamping too early on uninformative than

narrowing trials. This makes sense if children experience some increase in confidence on the narrowing trials when they are able to reject two of the potential referents. However, this difference is small.

Our main interest was to compare overall performance between the two groups. We identified the children who made the correct response on five or six trials. A Chi-square test (with correction for continuity) comparing the distribution of children in the two groups (34 (87%) reached this criterion in the stamp group and 16 (39%) did so in the know group) showed that performance by the stamp group was significantly better than that by the know group $\chi^2(1, N = 80) = 17.77, p < 0.001$.

Because we did not use a fully counterbalanced design, we looked at performance on the very first trial each child had. These data are shown in Table 4. The same pattern is seen as in the overall results. We checked using chi-square tests that children experiencing each order were equally likely to meet our criterion for success (one or no mistakes). There was no difference between orders for either the know or the stamp group (Know: 3 children in uninformative, narrowing, informative group successful, 6 in informative, uninformative, narrowing, 7 in narrowing, informative, uninformative. Stamp: 12, 10, 12 in the same groups respectively). Thus, we concluded that the order in which the trials were presented did not affect our overall results.

Note that a strategy of always waiting until the whole picture was revealed on the stamp game would not be successful as performance on informative trials as well as narrowing and uninformative trials was taken into account. Children in the stamp group were not simply adopting an overly cautious strategy. On 85% of informative trials they correctly made an interpretation before the second half of the picture was revealed.

We also note that the warm-up procedures differed between the conditions in order to introduce the child to the game they would play. It is possible that this difference led to the better performance by the stamp group. However, in both procedures we modeled the appropriate response when one was well and poorly informed: telling children in the know group that they did not know the correct referent and those in the stamp group that they should not yet stamp. This warm-up procedure for the know group goes beyond what is typically included in metacognitive tasks, and yet performance remained relatively poor. It would be interesting, in future studies, to see if children's performance on knowledge tasks improved following exposure to the stamp game warm up or experimental trials. Given the robustness of children's poor performance on these metacognitive tasks, we suspect that any improvement is unlikely.

One could parse the stamp game as offering multiple opportunities to choose between interpreting and delaying. Every moment as a tiny portion of the picture is revealed the child could be forced to make an explicit choice between making or delaying an interpretation. In Experiment 1 children found this kind of choice difficult to handle. When we look at tasks that require waiting that children find difficult, we can see that not only do they involve an explicit choice, but also they differ in why children need to delay their response. In the delay game and the "ask the man" tasks the appropriate thing to do is to wait until information is provided that allows you to decide between alternative possibilities. In Klahr's indeterminacy task, children must wait to see if this will prove to be an occasion when they cannot tell. Perhaps what is critical here is understanding why one needs to wait. We suggest that the stamp game is easy because it does not force the children to make this explicit choice or to understand the purpose of waiting. Instead,

children are simply waiting until they can identify the picture. Children can delay making a response on encountering ambiguous input (the stamp game), but this is an incidental aspect of their waiting until they know the correct interpretation. There is no evidence that they can choose to delay in preference to making an interpretation (the delay game) or that they understand that delaying is sometimes a good strategy to adopt..

General Discussion

Children's performance on these tasks offers new insight into their difficulties with ambiguous input. We considered two explanations for the apparent mismatch between the majority of studies that found poor performance on ambiguity tasks by young children and a subset that appeared to show appropriate hesitant behavior. One possibility was that we might reveal an early understanding of ambiguity if children were offered the strategy of delaying a response and waiting for new information. This strategy had not been offered to children in previous studies, although other alternatives to making an interpretation, e.g., "ask the man" or searching potential hiding places had been used. In Experiment 1 we found that although 7- and 8- year olds could use the delay strategy reasonably well, 5- and 6- year olds found it no easier to use this strategy than to answer a "Do you know..?" question. Both tasks were relatively difficult for the younger children.

The delay game and the know game shared the need to make an explicit choice between strategies. A second possibility was that this element of decision making was particularly difficult for children. The stamp game did not require a choice between strategies (delay or interpret). Children's performance on this new procedure was impressive. In Experiment 2, only five children (13%) made 2 or more mistakes on their

six stamp game trials. Twenty-five (61%) children made this many mistakes on the knowledge evaluation game. Children were able to delay their responses, but this was when they were focused on waiting until they knew the referent rather than making a choice to delay based on understanding that this was the most appropriate response to ambiguous input. These results suggest that at least one reason why children find it difficult to handle ambiguous information is because the tasks require a judgment about how to deal with it or how suitable it is for interpretation.

How can we characterize this judgmental or decision making difficulty more precisely? In the theory of mind literature Perner and colleagues (see particularly Dienes & Perner, 1999) make a representational argument. They argue that judgmental false belief tasks require one to represent reality and an individual's perspective on this reality. In contrast, tasks that do not make these judgmental demands can be solved by doing no more than representing reality. A similar argument made about the ambiguity literature could suggest that children find it easy to identify the multiple possible referents of ambiguous messages. What they find difficult is understanding or representing the relationship between these potential referents and the input itself. One needs to relate the input to the referents to understand why the ambiguity has arisen (the message was inadequate because there were multiple possible referents) and how the problem can be resolved. Interestingly, studies where children were asked to identify the multiple possibilities that could fit the input, but not explicitly evaluate their knowledge have found precocious success. Sophian and Somerville (1988) used a game where a toy was hidden in one of several possible locations. Children had to put out mats under each possible location to catch the toy. 4-year olds were able to mark multiple possible

locations under some circumstances. Beck, Robinson, Carroll, and Apperly (2006) used a similar task in a study of children's counterfactual thinking. A toy mouse was positioned at the top of a slide that had two possible exits. To pass the task children had to put out two mats to ensure that he landed safely whichever route he took. 3- and 4- year olds found this task relatively difficult, but 5- and 6- year olds' performance was substantially better (younger children put out two mats on 31% of trials, older on 68%). When children play the stamp game they need to monitor which are the possible referents as the game progresses until there is only one possibility. Then they stamp the matching picture. Children may find our stamp game and the two games described above easy because they require thinking about the possibilities, but not evaluation of knowledge or an explicit decision about how to deal with the input.

This is not the only way to explain what may be difficult about tasks that require the child to make a decision about how to deal with ambiguity. An alternative explanation focuses on the demands of weighing up the alternative strategies available. In the decision making tasks one has to imagine the consequences of the available courses of action. For example, in the delay game one may try to imagine what information will be gained by waiting for the clue. The information processing involved in imagining the consequences and contrasting them might overwhelm young children. In the tasks that children find easy there is no need to speculate about the consequences of different strategies. Our current data do not allow us to distinguish between these two possibilities, although it seems more difficult to explain how a problem with imagining consequences could lead to knowledge evaluation problems. However, further investigation of the

nature of these demands will allow us to be even more specific about children's difficulties with ambiguity.

Putting this issue to one side, we now examine how our findings fit with the theoretical accounts of ambiguity. In the introduction we identified two broad camps: representational accounts, which see children's problems as resulting from failure to understand that multiple interpretations of information are possible (e.g., Carpendale & Chandler, 1996; Apperly & Robinson, 1998), and performance accounts, which suggest that children understand the difficulties in interpretation that arise from ambiguous input, but believe that it is preferable to make (or cannot resist making) a guess (e.g., Ackerman, 1981; Speer, 1984). If these theories view children as being unable to resist making an interpretation (as an executive performance account would), it is not obvious how the latter performance theories could explain children's good performance on the stamp game. On the stamp game the instruction is to wait until you know. If children are inclined to make a guess as soon as possible, we would expect poor performance on the stamp game, at least equivalent to that on the know game. Alternatively might the stamp game reverse children's expectations that normally it is best to guess such that they now think it is polite to wait until the card has been revealed? This cannot explain children's good performance on the informative trials, where they showed a strong tendency to stamp before the picture was revealed.

Difficulties with the judgmental aspects of ambiguity tasks may fit better with the representational theories. Children's difficulty arises because they are unable to represent the relationship between the ambiguous input and its potential referents. Previous support for representational accounts have come from children's *difficulties* with ambiguous

input. In the stamp game we see success on a task that we argue reduces these representational demands. Perner and colleagues have talked about an implicit understanding of theory of mind, that is seen when the judgmental or decision making demands of false belief tasks are reduced. One possibility is to see children's success on the stamp game as evidence for implicit understanding of ambiguity. Indeed, a similar claim has been made based on children's differential eye movements on hearing ambiguous messages (Sekerina et al, 2004). It is true that when the first half of the picture was ambiguous, children's responses were almost always delayed until the whole picture was revealed. However, we are not convinced this is best conceived as implicit understanding. Implicit 'understanding' implies a similar type of understanding to that which is explicit but at a lower, or more inaccessible, level. Rather we favor the idea that children's good performance on the stamp game does not reveal understanding of ambiguity, but is an incidental consequence of other abilities. Children are able to wait until they can accurately identify a picture before they commit to an interpretation, but their focus here is on waiting for a single match with the target, not evaluating their knowledge when they are uncertain. Children are dealing with ambiguity in the sense that information presented in the task is ambiguous. However, if we think about the task from the child's perspective his or her job is to ignore ambiguous input and wait for disambiguating information. On our account what makes the stamp game easy is that children do not have to represent or make a decision about how to deal with ambiguous input.

Does this mean that good performance on the stamp game is in fact irrelevant to our thinking about children's understanding of ambiguity? Certainly, we claim that the

discrepancy between performance on the know and stamp games suggests that children have great difficulty deciding how to respond to ambiguous input. However, the stamp game clearly involves ambiguity, yet critically, at no point does the child have to recognize the input as such, or make a decision or judgment about it. The child is handling a task that involves ambiguous input by not responding to the ambiguity itself directly. This distinction is helpful in interpreting the recent finding that infants (14 – 20 months) used their shared history with an individual playing with a particular toy to interpret the individual's later ambiguous request, "Where's the ball?" (Saylor & Ganea, 2007). Although there were two balls, infants responded by finding the ball that they had played with together with the experimenter making the request. One could describe this task as involving the infant recognizing the problematic nature of the request, identifying that there are two potential referents, drawing on her past experience to disambiguate the message. It is more simple to think of the child's experience in this task as never really involving handling ambiguity. In other words, the message is ambiguous only from the perspective of someone who has not had the experience of playing with the experimenter. We suggest that from the child's point of view the message is never really ambiguous, or at the very least is not identified as such.

Our results support the claim that until the age of about 7 children have difficulty with ambiguity when they need to make a decision or judgment about it but not when this decision making is removed. Interestingly, this might have consequences for their behavior in everyday life. If children show a slight tendency to wait or hesitate, then this will often result in the ambiguity being resolved, perhaps through a parent's or teacher's disambiguating a message. However, if put on the spot making an interpretation is a good

strategy, that is unlikely to have terrible consequences even if the guess is wrong. Speer (1984) suggested that when children make interpretations, they do so knowing about the inadequacy of the input. Our view is that children do not explicitly understand these limitations, nor can they make a choice about the best course of action to deal with ambiguity. Children may well be able to engage in different strategies, but they have problems choosing between them. While we would not attribute an implicit understanding of ambiguity to young children, we suggest that making the choice between strategies explicit is a key contributor to children's difficulty with ambiguity.

References

- Ackerman, B. P. (1981). Performative bias in children's interpretations of ambiguous referential communications. *Child Development*, 52, 1224-1230.
- Acredolo, C. & Horobin, K. (1987). Development of relational reasoning and avoidance of premature closure. *Developmental Psychology*, 23, 13-21.
- Apperly, I. A. & Robinson, E. J. (1998). Children's mental representation of referential relations. *Cognition*, 67(3), 287-309.
- Bearison, D. J. & Levey, L. M. (1977). Children's comprehension of referential communication: Decoding ambiguous messages. *Child Development*, 48, 716-720.
- Beck, S. R. & Robinson, E. J. (2001). Children's ability to make tentative interpretations of ambiguous messages. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 79, 95-114.
- Beck, S. R., Robinson, E. J., Carroll, D. J., & Apperly, I. A. (2006). Children's thinking about counterfactuals and future hypotheticals as possibilities. *Child Development*, 77, 413-426.
- Carpendale, J. & Chandler, M. (1996). On the distinction between false belief understanding and subscribing to an interpretive theory of the mind. *Child Development*, 67, 1686-1706.

Chandler, M. (1988). Doubt and developing theories of mind. In J.W.Astington (Ed.), *Developing theories of mind* (1 ed., pp. 387-414). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clements, W. A. & Perner, J. (1994). Implicit understanding of belief. *Cognitive Development*, 9, 377-395.

Dienes, Z. & Perner, J. (1999). A theory of implicit and explicit knowledge. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 22, 735-755.

Fay, A.L. & Klahr, D. (1996). Knowing about guessing and guessing about knowing: Preschoolers' understanding of indeterminacy. *Child Development* 67, 689-716.

Flavell, J. H., Speer, J. R., Green, F. L., & August, D. L. (1981). The development of comprehension monitoring and knowledge about communication. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 46(5).

Ironsmith, M. & Whitehurst, G. J. (1978). The development of listener abilities in communication: how children deal with ambiguous information. *Child Development*, 49, 348-352.

Klahr, D. & Chen, Z. (2003). Overcoming the positive-capture strategy in young children: learning about indeterminacy. *Child Development*, 74, 1275 – 1296.

Patterson, C. J., Cosgrove, J. M., & O'Brien, R. G. (1980). Non-verbal indicants of comprehension and noncomprehension in children. *Developmental Psychology*, 16, 38-48.

Pillow, B. H. & Henrichon, A. J. (1996). There's more to the picture than meets the eye: young children's difficult understanding biased interpretation. *Child Development*, 67, 803-819.

Plumert, J. M. (1996). Young children's ability to detect ambiguity in descriptions of location. *Cognitive Development*, 11, 375-396.

Robinson, E. J. & Robinson, W. P. (1977). Development in the understanding of causes of success and failure in verbal communication. *Cognition*, 5, 363-378.

Robinson, E. J. & Robinson, W. P. (1982). Knowing when you don't know enough: Children's judgements about ambiguous information. *Cognition*, 12, 267-280.

Robinson E. J. & Whittaker, S. J. (1985) Children's responses to ambiguous messages and their understanding of ambiguity. *Developmental Psychology*, 21(3), 446-454.

Robinson, E. J. & Whittaker, S. J. (1986). Children's conceptions of meaning-message relationships. *Cognition*, 22, 41-60.

Saylor, M.M. & Ganea, P. (2007) Infants interpret ambiguous request for absent objects. *Developmental Psychology*, 43, 696-704.

Sekerina, I., Stromswold, K., & Hestvik, A. (2004). How do adults and children process referentially ambiguous pronouns? *Journal of Child Language*, 31, 123-152.

Singer, J. B. & Flavell, J. H. (1981). Development of Knowledge About Communication – Children's Evaluations of Explicitly Ambiguous Messages. *Child Development*, 52 (4), 1211-1215.

Somerville, S. C., Hadkinson, B. A., & Greenberg, C. (1979) Two levels of inferential behavior in young children. *Child Development*, 50 (1), 119-131

Sophian, C. & Somerville, S. C. (1988). Early developments in logical reasoning - considering alternative possibilities. *Cognitive Development*, 3, 183-222.

Speer, J. R. (1984). 2 Practical Strategies Young-Children Use to Interpret Vague Instructions. *Child Development*, 55, 1811-1819.

Taylor, M. (1988). Conceptual perspective taking: Children's ability to distinguish what they know from what they see. *Child Development*, 59, 703-718.

Table 1

Mean number of correct answers on delay and know games, Experiment 1.

		Mean correct answers (95% C.I.)	
		(Maximum 2)	
		Younger, N = 25	Older, N = 20
Delay	Ambiguous	1.20 (.82 – 1.58)	1.80 (1.56 – 2.04)
	Informative	1.52 (1.16 – 1.88)	1.90 (1.76 – 2.04)
Know	Ambiguous	0.76 (0.40 – 1.12)	1.20 (0.78 – 1.62)
	Informative	2.00 (ceiling)	1.85 (1.62 – 2.08)

Table 2

Number of correct answers on know and delay games, Experiment 1

			Delay, number of trials correct (Maximum 4)	
			0-2	3-4
Younger N = 25	Know, number of trials	0-2	9	4
	correct (Maximum 4)	3-4	5	7
Older N = 20	Know, number of trials	0-2	1	6
	correct (Maximum 4)	3-4	0	13

Table 3

Number of correct answers for each trial on know and stamp games, Experiment 2.

	Number of trials correct (Maximum 2)					
	Know			Stamp		
	0	1	2	0	1	2
Uninformative	11	12	14	0	0	39
Narrowing	16	9	12	0	9	30
Informative	0	1	36	3	6	30

Table 4

Performance on first trials, Experiment 2

	Know, N=41		Stamp, N=39	
	Fail	Pass	Fail	Pass
Uninformative	6	8	0	14
Narrowing	4	9	2	12
Informative	0	14	3	8